



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,566	08/29/2006	Robert C. Moschel	253443	3649
45733	7590	09/08/2009		
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.			EXAMINER	
TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900			JAISLE, CECILIA M	
180 NORTH STETSON AVENUE				
CHICAGO, IL 60601-6731			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
09/08/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

Chgpatent@leydig.com
Chgpatent1@leydig.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/585,566	MOSCHEL ET AL.	
	Examiner Cecilia M. Jaisle	Art Unit 1624	

All Participants:(1) Cecilia M. Jaisle. (3) _____.(2) Dr. Xavier Pillai, for Applicants. (4) _____.**Date of Interview:** 1 September 2009**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.**Rejection(s) discussed:***Rejection of claims 31, 32, 60 and 61 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.***Claims discussed:***Claims 61 and 63***Prior art documents discussed:***None***Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:***See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Cecilia M. Jaisle/
 Examiner, Art Unit 1624

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner stated that the outstanding Office Action of July 20, 2009 is a Non-Final Rejection.

The examiner also stated that the rejection of Claim 61 was in error. Claim 61 should have been indicated to be allowed. Claims 63 should have been indicated to be rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

*With those clarifications, Dr. Pillai will prepare and file a timely response.